

DEFT Draft Report 9/24/98 version

1. P. ii, Para 2 Do not use "recommend" to describe assignment. "Describe" would be better.

This paragraph misses an important part of the assignment, namely, evaluating each alternative for the effects of all CALFED actions-i.e. upstream, in-Delta and harvest.

2. Pii, para 4- Replace "nor does it have the full support..." with a separate sentence: DEFT does not recommend it as CALFED's Preferred Alternative.

The last sentence in this paragraph is in the wrong place. All alternatives have this qualification, so it needs to be said earlier.

3. The Executive Overview needs a whole new section describing DEFT's recommendations on conceptual features of a preferred alternative and Stage 1 actions.

4. P ii, structural changes section- The only structural change in the DEFT Scenario is the 2,000 cfs Hood diversion. The other changes described are Stage 1 actions, not part of the Scenario.

All alternatives were evaluated with an operable HOR barrier, and the DEFT Scenario was evaluated assuming full new screens at CVP and SWP. The report submitted by the salmon team makes the same mistake, which I was probably responsible for.

5. P iii, first bullet- We need to be specific on the assumed E/I ratios, at least someplace in the report.

6. Piii, 4th bullet- Delete this item. Again it refers to Stage 1 actions and not to the DEFT Scenario.

7. P iii, NoName Actions- Was Madera Ranch actually in the operations study?

8. P iii, Salmon summary- This needs to be replaced. I am circulating a summary to the Salmon Team for review.

9. The ing=roduction needs changes parallel to those described for the executive summary.

10. P. 3 Terry Mills needs to be added to the Salmon Team. Many of the Harvest Team members need asterisks.

11. P. 4 #1- Add: "and move them to their historical rearing areas" to the hypothesis.

12. P. 4 # 2- Substitute the following for the hypotheses: "Production of a variety of fishes and their food web is enhanced through a variety of processes when X2 is located farther downstream."

13. P. 4 #7- Substitute the following hypothesis: "Survival of salmon smolts migrating from the Sacramento system via the Delta Cross Channel or Georgiana Slough is substantially less than for those which stay in the lower Sacramento River."

14. P. 4 #10- This either needs to be expanded to include improved habitat in other areas of the estuary or a separate point is needed re habitat in areas other than the south Delta.

15. P. 5 #11- This implies a probability of adverse effects from environmental actions which is over generalized. Most of the enumerated environmental actions would tend to improve water quality. The only one likely to contribute to water quality problems is #7. Hence, this point should either be dropped or reworded to deal with the specific consequences of #7.

16. P. 5 Approach- This incorrectly characterizes the Habitat Team. That team prepared a specific proposal for habitat improvement measures in the Delta and Suisun Bay. The salmon team evaluated habitat and other measures upstream of the Delta on salmon.

17. P. 5 Discriminating Factors- This section only pertains to indicators used to evaluate entrainment and hydrodynamic effects. It either needs to be eliminated or made subservient to the next section.

18. P. 6 Add "conditions for upstream migration" to list of assessments.

19. P. 7 Habitat Team- Substitute: "The Habitat Team reviewed habitat actions in the Delta and Suisun Bay included int the ERP and prepared a specific list of measures to recommend for implementation during Stage 1."

20. P. 8-18- This all needs to be placed at the end to describe what Deft proposes as a follow up to the alternatives evaluation.

21. P. 12 #6- The description needs to be modified to be consistent with the current proposal. Also use 10,300 @ 0.33 throughout.

22. P. 13 Real time Flexibility is redundant and should be deleted.